



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

10/574,140

03/29/2006

Gerardus P. Karman

GB 030176

7741

24737

7590

01/25/2010

PHILIPS INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY & STANDARDS

P.O. BOX 3001

BRIARCLIFF MANOR, NY 10510

EXAMINER

SPAR, ILANA L

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2629

MAIL DATE

DELIVERY MODE

01/25/2010

PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

<p align="center">Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief</p>	<p>Application No. 10/574,140</p>	<p>Applicant(s) KARMAN ET AL.</p>	
	<p>Examiner ILANA SPAR</p>	<p>Art Unit 2629</p>	

--The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

THE REPLY FILED 11 January 2010 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE.

1. ☒ The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on the same day as filing a Notice of Appeal. To avoid abandonment of this application, applicant must timely file one of the following replies: (1) an amendment, affidavit, or other evidence, which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in compliance with 37 CFR 41.31; or (3) a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114. The reply must be filed within one of the following time periods:

- a) ☐ The period for reply expires _____ months from the mailing date of the final rejection.
b) ☒ The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection.

Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f).

Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

NOTICE OF APPEAL

2. ☐ The Notice of Appeal was filed on _____. A brief in compliance with 37 CFR 41.37 must be filed within two months of the date of filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal. Since a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed within the time period set forth in 37 CFR 41.37(a).

AMENDMENTS

3. ☒ The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will not be entered because
(a) ☒ They raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);
(b) ☐ They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below);
(c) ☐ They are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or
(d) ☐ They present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.

NOTE: _____. (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).

4. ☐ The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121. See attached Notice of Non-Compliant Amendment (PTOL-324).
5. ☐ Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): _____.
6. ☐ Newly proposed or amended claim(s) _____ would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the non-allowable claim(s).
7. ☒ For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) ☒ will not be entered, or b) ☐ will be entered and an explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended.
The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:
Claim(s) allowed: _____.
Claim(s) objected to: 18 and 31.
Claim(s) rejected: 1-17, 19-22, 24-30, 32-35.
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: _____.

AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE

8. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but before or on the date of filing a Notice of Appeal will not be entered because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and sufficient reasons why the affidavit or other evidence is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).
9. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing a Notice of Appeal, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will not be entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to overcome all rejections under appeal and/or appellant fails to provide a showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 41.33(d)(1).
10. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation of the status of the claims after entry is below or attached.

REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER

11. ☒ The request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because:
See Continuation Sheet.
12. ☐ Note the attached Information *Disclosure Statement*(s). (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s). _____.
13. ☐ Other: _____.

/Bipin Shalwala/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2629

Continuation of 11.

The amendments to independent claims 1 and 22 fail to place the application in condition for allowance. Examiner disagrees with Applicant's argument that Sawabe fails to teach "an intensity compensation device for further controlling light transmission characteristics of pixels within a group to compensate for an angular size of view, of the respective light source, via said pixels in a second axis of the display panel, wherein the second axis is transverse to the first axis." The LUT taught by Sawabe is used to adjust pixel data values that vary according to a viewing angle. Specifically, Sawabe teaches a viewing angle characteristic which provides different views of an image based on the angle upon which the display is viewed (see column 1, lines 43-46). The LUT then compensates for the viewing angle characteristic ("light transmission characteristic" as cited in claim 1) for all pixels, which lie in "a second axis of the display," i.e. the x-axis of the display. Further, Applicant has stated in the remarks section of the most recent response that "viewing angle dependency relates to pixels, not light sources." Therefore, the LUT, in compensating for the pixel data values, and not the positioning of the light sources, is resolving the issue of viewing angle dependency as defined by Applicant.

With reference to the amended portion of claim 1 that recites "a display panel having a plurality of separately addressable pixels for displaying said image, the pixels being grouped such that different pixels in a group correspond to different views of the image as a function of an angle with respect to a first axis, each pixel in a group being positioned relative to a respective discrete light source," Balogh teaches all portions of this limitation, including the newly added portion (see paragraph 39, lines 1-7 and Figure 3a). The light sources emit light in all directions, such that the combination of the light sources as viewed at any position along the horizontal axis of the display (i.e. at an angle with respect to the first, vertical axis), will provide a unique view according to the viewing position.

Examiner maintains that it would have been obvious to combine the teachings of Balogh and Sawabe for the purpose of allowing a viewer to see a fully accurate and corrected image intensity (light transmission) at each angle of the display as taught by Balogh.